

### Interview Summary

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Huynh and Primary Examiner Hong for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representatives during the personal interview conducted on February 6, 2001. The foregoing amendments and the following remarks reflect the substance of the interview.

#### **35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Kauffman/Berry et al./Boezeman et al. Rejection**

Claims 1, 4 and 9-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,586,235 to Kauffman ("Kauffman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,692,205 to Berry et al. ("Berry") and U.S. Patent No. 5,889,519 to Boezeman et al. ("Boezeman"). Claims 4 and 9 depend from claim 1. Claims 11-14 depend from claim 10. This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite "choreographing information for allowing a document author to define the timing at which the first file support object and the second file support object are retrieved by a user, the choreographing information comprising data slices from the first file support object interleaved with data slices from the second file support object so as to incrementally display the first file support object and the second file support object to the user." Neither Kauffman, Berry, nor Boezeman, alone or in combination, teach or suggest at least this feature of amended independent claims 1 and 10.

Kauffman is directed to an interactive multimedia system and method that provides a standard document structure for organizing and storing information. See Kauffman at col. 2, ll. 35-39. The document includes at least one page, and the page contains at least one asset file and a page execution script. See Kauffman at col. 2, ll. 39-51; col. 6, l. 50. Authoring code is used to create the page execution scripts which instruct when to display or play information contained in the asset file. See Kauffman at col. 12, ll. 62-65. However, Kauffman fails to describe or suggest choreographing information for allowing a document author to define the timing at which the first file support object and the second file support object are retrieved by a user, the choreographing information comprising data slices from the first file support object interleaved with data slices from the second file support object so as to incrementally display the first file support object and the second file support object to the user, as recited in claims 1 and 10.

Berry is directed to a method and system for integration of multimedia presentations within an object oriented user interface which provides for encapsulating multimedia data within an object. See Berry at col. 2, ll. 41-45. Berry does not require separate audio or video objects to be manipulated by the user. See Berry at col. 2, ll. 41-45. However, Berry does not remedy the failure of Kauffman to describe or suggest choreographing information for allowing a document author to define the timing at which the first file support object and the second file support object are retrieved by a user, the choreographing information comprising data slices from the first file support object interleaved with data slices from the second file support object so as to incrementally display the first file support object and the second file support object to the user, as recited in claims 1 and 10.

Boezeman is directed to a method and system for a multimedia application development sequence editor using a wrap corral which allows parts of a multimedia title to be continuously played or shown. See Boezeman at col. 2, ll. 41-46. Boezeman describes a sequence editor user interface tool for synchronizing objects. See Boezeman at col. 5, ll. 40-50. However, Boezeman does not remedy the failure of Kauffman and Berry to describe or suggest choreographing information for allowing a document author to define the timing at which the first file support object and the second file support object are retrieved by a user, the choreographing information comprising data slices from the first file support object interleaved with data slices from the second file support object so as to incrementally display the first file support object and the second file support object to the user, as recited in claims 1 and 10.

Amended independent claims 1 and 10 thus are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 4, 9, and 11-14 are allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Kauffman/Berry/Boezeman/Ando Rejection**

Claims 2, 3, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauffman, Berry, and Boezeman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,600,826 to Ando (“Ando”). Claims 2, 3, 7, and 8 depend from claim 1. This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the independent claims, is respectfully traversed.

Ando is directed to a structured data processor for converting between sequential and tree structured data, including a structured data treating unit for editing data. See Ando at col. 4, ll. 25-43; col. 6, ll. 44-47. Ando fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kauffman, Berry, and Boezeman with respect to amended independent claim 1. Claims 2, 3, 7, and 8 thus are allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits.

Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Kauffman/Berry/Boezeman/Johnson Rejection**

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauffman, Berry, and Boezeman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,892,847 to Johnson (“Johnson”). Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1. This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the independent claims, is respectfully traversed.

Johnson is directed to a method and apparatus for compressing images, including an encoder that creates a file format that layers the compressed image. See Johnson at col. 4, ll. 30-49. Johnson fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kauffman, Berry, and Boezeman with respect to amended independent claim 1. Claims 5 and 6 thus are allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits.

Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Kauffman/Berry/Boezeman/Brown Rejection**

Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauffman, Berry, and Boezeman, and further in view of Brown (Using Netscape 2, 1995) (“Brown”). Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 10. This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the independent claims, is respectfully traversed.

Brown is directed to the use of frames in an HTML document. See Brown at 773-777. Brown fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kauffman, Berry, and Boezeman with respect to amended independent claim 10. Claims 15 and 16 thus are allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits.

Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicant : David Corboy  
Serial No. : 08/866,857  
Filed : May 30, 1997  
Page : 9



Attorney's Docket No.: 75-124001 / Multimedia 15

### CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance. A check in payment of excess claims fees required by the above amendment is enclosed. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 8, 2001

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott R. Boalick  
Reg. No. 42,337

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
601 Thirteenth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40046928.doc